

REMARKS

1. The Examiner has objected to the drawings under MPEP §608.02(g) because FIG. 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--.

Corrected drawings sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 (d) are enclosed. Each replacement drawing is labeled as "replacement sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121 (d).

2. The Examiner has objected to claims 12-18 because in claims 12 and 18, last line, "maximum/minimum" should be --maximum/minimum amplitude—for clarity (specification, page 17, lines 14-16).

Claims 12 and 18 has been amended. It is believed that claim 12 as amended overcomes Examiners' objection. It is also believed that claims 13-17 as being dependent on claim 12 as amended also overcome Examiners' objection.

Claim 18 has been amended. It is believed that claim 18 as amended overcomes Examiners' objection.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U. S. C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Fujioka (US 2002/0193073). Claims 1-3 are canceled.

4. The Examiner has indicated that claims 4-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

October 7, 2005

10

Serial No.10/639,926

intervening claims.

Claims 4-11 are amended and rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is believed that claims 4-11 are in condition of allowance.

5. Claims 12-18 are rewritten and are believed to be in condition of allowance.

6. Claims 1-3 are canceled. Now claims 4-18 are pending and are believed to be in condition of allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully solicited.

October 7, 2005

Respectfully Submitted,



Boris Tankhilevich

Reg. No. 38,689.

Patent Attorney for the Applicant.